

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5, and 9 are amended, and claims 10-19 are withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1-9 are responsive to the Examiner's comments, and that claims 1-9 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1-9 are responsive to the Examiner's comments, and that claims 1-9 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,818,419 to Tajima et al. (hereinafter "Tajima"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tajima fails to disclose all the claimed features, as required under Section 102. Tajima does not disclose or teach "setting one frame period of at least one of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  frame and the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  frame variably for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  frame and the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  frame to have a same period of a brightness expression period," and the combination thereof, as recited in independent claim 1. Unlike the claimed features, Tajima discloses a duplicated subframe method of converting and rearranging subframes to resolve the problem of flickering, as described in column 13, lines 44-

55 and Figures 39-41. Tajima cannot disclose or teach each and every element and the combination thereof. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims, 2-9 are allowable over Tajima at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Claims 1-3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,835,072 to Kanazawa (hereinafter "Kanazawa"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kanazawa fails to disclose all the claimed features, as required under Section 102. Kanazawa does not teach nor suggest, "setting one frame period of at least one of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  frame and the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  frame variably for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  frame and the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  frame to have a same period of a brightness expression period." As described at column 11, line 39, Kanazawa discloses "a luminance level should be the same among the first, second, and third periods." Based on such a disclosure, Kanazawa cannot anticipate each and every element and the combination thereof. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims, 2-9 are allowable over Kanazawa at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Claims 1 and 2 further stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,898,414 to Awamoto et al. (hereinafter "Awamoto"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Awamoto fails to disclose or teach all of the claimed features, as required under Section 102. For example, Awamoto fails to disclose or teach “setting one frame period of at least one of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  frame and the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  frame variably for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  frame and the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  frame to have a same period of a brightness expression period.” As disclosed at column 2, lines 38-41, Awamoto discloses “the display control circuit should preferably control a total light producing period within one frame so that the total light producing period remains constant.” Based on such a disclosure, Awamoto cannot anticipate each and every element as and the combination thereof. Accordingly withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims, 2-9 are allowable over Awamoto at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Dependent claims 4-8 have not been rejected over art, other than Sections 101 and 112 rejections, and are assumed to be allowable if such rejections are overcome.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Serial No. **10/797,578**

Docket No. **HI-0192**

Amendment dated **August 8, 2007**

Reply to Office Action of **March 8, 2007**

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Daniel Y.J. Kim**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Correspondence Address:  
P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200  
703 766-3777 DYK/HDG/lhd/dak

Date: **August 8, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-198\125679.doc